

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action having a mailing date of April 3, 2007.

Claims 3, 6, 9-13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22-27 and 30 have been amended. Claim 37 has been added. No new matter has been inserted. Claims 3-17, 19-28 and 30 and 32-37 remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections.

The specification has been amended to address the Examiner's objections. The claims have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections and rejections.


Applicant incorporates by reference the extensive comments regarding Edwards and Wessel from its previous Amendment in their entireties. Many of the physical differences, as well as fundamental differences in operation and function, between Applicant's invention and the devices in Edwards and Wessel were noted in Applicant's previous response. The Amendments made in this response further emphasize such structural differences between Applicant's invention and the inventions shown in Edwards and Wessel.

As to new claim 37, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Edwards or Wessel disclose a medical apparatus falling under the categories listed in this newly added claim.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all objections and rejections. Favorable action is respectfully requested. Applicant has completely responded to the Office Action dated August 13, 2007

If there are any additional charges, including extension of time, please bill our Deposit Account No. 503180.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel S. Polley, Reg. No. 34,902

DANIEL S. POLLEY, P.A.

**CUSTOMER NO. 44538**

I:\1000\1023 Bryant\Patent Amendments\8009(4thmend-Meidcal Apparatus).doc